

E

B

M

THE
FUTURE GOVERNMENT
OF
CANADA:
BEING
ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF A
BRITISH AMERICAN INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC.
COMPRISING A
REFUTATION OF THE POSITION TAKEN BY
THE HON. T. D'ARCY MCGEE,
In the British American Magazine,
FOR A
MONARCHICAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

BY T. PHILLIPS THOMPSON,

OF ST. CATHARINES, C. W.

ST. CATHARINES:

H. F. LEAVENWORTH'S "HERALD" POWER PRESS.

1864.

THE

BRITISH AMERICAN INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC

OF

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

BRITISH AMERICAN INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC

CONSTITUTION

REPUTATION OF THE POSITION TAKEN BY

THE HON. T. D'ARCY MCGEE

In the British American Republic

FOR A

MONARCHICAL FORM OF GOVERNMENT

BY T. PHILLIPS THOMPSON

OF ST. CATHARINES, C.W.

ST. CATHARINES:

H. E. LEVAYNORTH'S "REPUBLIC" POWER PRESS

1864

P R E F A C E .

The recent change in the aspect of political affairs, almost if not quite unparalleled in the history of Canada, occurring as it did when this work was in the hands of the printer, has of course not been considered in the following pages, or influenced the writer's opinions as there laid down. Any conclusions drawn, or arguments brought forward from the situation of political parties are consequently based upon the positions occupied by them previous to late developments. We may also add, that taking into account the concessions promised to be made to the Reform sentiment of the country, our views on some of the matters of detail, treated on towards the latter part of the work, have been perhaps somewhat modified. However, the main question entered into—that of the adaptability of Republicanism to Canada—is of course unaffected by the new order of things, never having been in any way a party issue.

THE

Future Government of Canada.

It is obvious that sooner or later the time must come for Canada to cease her present connexion with the British Empire. As with individuals, so with nations. The child, long protected by the care of a parent, must at length assume the dignity and responsibilities of manhood. When such time does arrive, it will be for the Canadian people, as a matter of course, to choose their future form of government. To throw out a few suggestions, not so much to influence such a choice as to bring the subject before the people, and to induce reflection on this important question, is the object of the present effort.

We have been in some measure led to this undertaking by the perusal of several articles on this subject, published a few months since, in the British American Magazine, from the pen of the Hon. T. D'Arcy McGee. We shall endeavor to combat the views presented by him, and, in addition to answering his arguments, present some considerations which have presented themselves in favor of the other side of the question.

Before entering upon our subject we would premise, that the conclusions to be drawn from our remarks are intended solely to apply to British America. Without this limitation they might be considered somewhat revolutionary in their tendency, but the term is hardly applicable to efforts, not for the overturning and remodelling of existing institutions, but for the formation of new ones. This work is undertaken solely upon our own responsibility, unconnected with any party or clique; and on this account the present form of publication was chosen,

rather than the more usual one through the columns of the journals. This leaves us in a position to state our opinions with somewhat more freedom.

In the first of these articles to which allusion has been made, which is entitled "A Plea for British American Nationality," and appears in the last August number of the British American Magazine, we read:—

"It cannot be denied by any Canadian, that, since the era of Responsible Government, we have advanced constantly towards the American and receded from the British standard of government. The power and patronage of the Crown has been reduced to the lowest point; the Upper House has been made elective; the franchise has been extended; the period required by law for the naturalization of aliens has been reduced to three years; the public lands have ceased to be Crown lands; the public Departments have been transferred from Imperial to Provincial control. Many of these reforms, or all of them, are or may be real improvements; they are only here referred to in evidence of the assertion, that year by year, and step by step, we are advancing towards an unrecognized Americanism, which must have its perils and risks as well as its attractions."

What other inference could be drawn from the above paragraph than that the changes there mentioned, which even Mr. McGee must admit "are or may be real improvements," are undesirable solely on account of their tendency towards "an unrecognised Americanism," which the author sagely concludes "*must have its perils and risks.*" The writer asserts that, in making these changes—"real improvements"—be it observed, we have "advanced towards the American standard of government." In his opinion, this state of things must be remedied. No more such "improvements" in the future. When any new measure is proposed, the first question must be, not whether it will be for the good of the country, and if its effects will be beneficial, but, does it tend towards Americanism? Does it "recede from the British standard of government?" In fact, the government is not, as we had in our ignorance supposed, made for the people; but the people for the government. And

our mission on this continent is not to develop and extend our civilization, as we best can, under whatever political institutions we find best suited to ourselves ; but to institute and sustain, at all cost, a system of constitutional monarchy, regardless of its adaptability to the age and circumstances in which we find ourselves placed.

Mr. McGee speaks of "the other two choices before us, annexation or closer connexion with the main body of the Empire." He never seems to have conceived that there was a possibility of British America existing as an Independent Republic. In fact, we generally hear the subject treated of as if Republicanism necessarily implied annexation, and the subsequent introduction of the worst features of the American system. We shall endeavor to show that there is, in reality, no necessary connexion between them. What is there, we would ask, to prevent the existence of a British American Independent Republic? It would afford a temptation to the cupidity of our American neighbors, says one, and be unable to resist their persistent attacks, either by negotiation, or, failing in that, by armed force. Would not a Monarchy or Aristocracy be equally, or, if anything rather more liable to this objection? Surely, if Canada can exist as an independent nation, the fact of her possessing a Republican government would render her less likely to incur the hostility of the neighboring Republic than if differently ruled. Not that we think this of itself any argument in favor of Republicanism. We do not say that in forming our government we should consult the opinions and interests of our neighbors ; on the contrary, we believe it to be our duty to establish just such a system as will best suit us, whether pleasing or displeasing to those around us, who are not as capable of judging of our requirements as ourselves. We only speak of it in answer to the possible argument of weakness and liability to American hostility—as shewing that a Republic is at least in as good a position in this respect as a Monarchy. Think you that the sentiment of nationality is less strong in a Republic than a monarchy? Was Rome of the Consuls less intensely national than Rome of the Cæsars? Has Switzerland less of the national feeling than Germany or France? On the contrary, if we look at continental Europe, we find the Radical or Republican party

identified with national aspirations, and eager for national unity. This is the case more especially with the Italian and German Radicals; while the Prussian and Austrian sovereigns, and the petty Princes and Nobles of Germany, are endeavoring, to the utmost of their power, to prevent the success of the efforts for German unity.

There is nothing more common in monarchical governments than to find a foreigner occupying the throne—who, surrounded as he usually is with foreign parasites and office-seekers—a stranger to the manners and often almost to the language of the country, is naturally looked upon with distrust and suspicion. Under such circumstances, to which a hereditary monarchy is always liable, the stability and security which are the supposed attributes of Monarchical government alone, will be materially weakened; and in such a case a foreign invader will always find a disaffected party at home ready to hail them as deliverers from what they may in some cases plausibly call a foreign yoke. It is the complaint of the "Scandinavian" party in Denmark, that the present monarch of that unfortunate country is too German in his antecedents and proclivities, and on that account he is naturally regarded by them with some degree of distrust. "The late king," say they, "had his fault, but at any rate *he* was a *Dane*." Of course we do not cite this instance in support of our immediately preceding proposition, but merely as a case where a monarchical nation, attacked by a foreign aggressor, does not present that united front which they might under a different form of government. Mexico under Maximilian, even were he sustained by a large majority of the people, would be an easier prey to the hostile attempts of a foreign power than were the old Mexican Republic. We think, then, that a Republic would be as safe from aggression from abroad, and as strong in a pervading sentiment of nationality, as a Monarchy could possibly be.

A little further on in the article to which our attention has been directed, we find the following:—

"Hitherto, American ideas of government have so troubled or dominated all the populations of the New World—especially those of us nearest their source—that Constitutional Monarchy has never as yet had a fair audience from this age."

Is it, we would enquire, so very remarkable, that in *America*—*British America* 'tis true, but still *America*—American ideas as well on government as on other subjects, should prevail? We suppose by the "source" alluded to, the United States is meant. If so, we are at a loss with respect to the meaning of the expression, "especially those nearest their source." We, in Canada, live about as near the source of these American ideas as any other nation, and yet we doubt if we are "troubled" with them as much as Central and South America, much further from the source of Republicanism.

An exception, it is true, exists—Brazil. There the system of Monarchy "has been fairly tried," and "for half a century Brazil has known no serious domestic disturbances." It strikes us that Mr. McGee has been rather unfortunate in the solitary instance he has brought forward of an American Monarchy, when we remember that Brazil, the only American State where the monarchical principle obtains, is likewise the only slaveholding nation in South America. Mexico and Central America also, in addition to the other Spanish American Republics, have deemed national liberty inconsistent with personal slavery, and have accordingly abolished the system within their dominions. Still, in Brazil, "no serious disturbances" have occurred. "Order," we all know, once "reigned in Warsaw." The abominations and cruelties of slavery exist, but then they take place *quietly*. A slave may be whipped or burned to death occasionally, but nobody makes any noise about it—no "serious disturbance" ever occurs in consequence. Happy state of quiescence!

Again, speaking of the American civil war:—"The demonstration it is to furnish is as yet incomplete, and prudence warns us against drawing too hasty conclusions; but in whatever else the present contest may issue, it cannot issue as all civilized monarchies have at one time or other done, in a voluntary restoration, giving a new lease to the old government."

Does Mr. McGee contend that the old French Monarchy "issued in a voluntary restoration, giving a new lease to the old government."

A little further on, he "concludes the experiment (Republican government) to have failed." This conclusion strikes us as rather strange, after his admission that "the demonstration it is

to furnish is as yet incomplete." If American Republicanism is to be deemed a failure on account of the present situation of the nation, and the seemingly insurmountable difficulties with which it was beset on every side, what an irretrievable and complete failure was English Monarchy during the Parliamentary civil war, and the subsequent military dictatorship of Cromwell!

We now come to the second of these articles, which appears in the October number of the Magazine, and is entitled "A further Plea for British American Nationality." The subject of Monarchy is hardly touched upon in this article, which treats principally of the necessity of a strong union between the Provinces, and a closer connexion with Britain.

Now, with regard to the latter point, it seems to us that by the writer's own admission, the fact of our possessing a Republican form of government would not necessarily preclude this closer connexion with Great Britain, which the writer seems so ardently to desire.

Speaking of the Provinces, towards the conclusion of the piece, the writer observes, "That they should advance to sovereignty is as natural as that youth should grow to manhood; but there is not inevitable inference to be drawn that sovereignty should include separation."

"A very limited acquaintance with the varieties of Imperial constitutions which have existed, and do even still exist in the world, will leave sovereignty in the members of an Empire to be entirely compatible with the unity of the whole body."

And this not without regard to their form of government, or even different forms united in the same Empire, as the author has previously shown.

"The German Empire, from the Peace of Westphalia (1648) to the substitution of the title of Emperor of Austria for Emperor of Germany, by Francis II., in 1806, was a Federal Empire. At one time it contained not less than three hundred and fifty-five sovereign states or cities, *royal*, ducal, hereditary, electoral, ecclesiastical and *republican*."

So that our form of government need be no bar to the formation of that closer union with England, so warmly advocated by Mr. McGee, in case such Federal union was considered desirable by the people. Undoubtedly great and important

advantages would accrue to Canada from the development of this scheme, of substituting nearer and more defined relations between England and British America, instead of the present loose and anomalous arrangement. By it we should be enabled to rise to our proper position among the nations—an ally, instead of a dependent upon England—united with, rather than absorbed by, the Empire. But it should be remembered that two parties are required to every agreement; and we have no reason to suppose that there is any intention on the part of Great Britain of introducing the Federal relation between the Mother Country and the Colonies; and, consequently, we shall consider this question as subordinate to the one which more immediately claims our attention. For it is surely our place first to determine what our home government shall be, before we consider the relations it should occupy in the future with other countries.

Respecting the subject of a stronger union between the Provinces, also entered upon in this paper, we shall not have much to remark. It is a question upon which nearly all are agreed, that if we are to exist as a united nation, we must have a more cohesive and binding union—which shall be a union in fact, as well as merely in name. This union we shall require, whatever may be the nature of our government. But we need not to discuss it at present, as we find it alluded to more fully in the next article of the series.

This brings us to the third and last of these papers, published in the *British American Magazine* for December last, under the heading of "A Monarchy or a Republic—which?" Although it does not bear the name of the author of the previous articles, it is probably from the same pen. Be this as it may, it treats on the same question, and is principally devoted to the advocacy of Aristocracy—showing its necessity in every Monarchical form of government.

"A Constitutional Monarchy" says our author, "must have more than the two orders of king and people." "And there must be at least three broadly distinguished orders of estates—the Crown, the nobility, and the mass of the people."

"The Monarchy can exist only on condition of its possessing an Order of nobility."

Now, it is chiefly on this very ground—the necessity of an aristocracy—that our opposition to a Monarchy is based ; and all through the present work, we shall rather direct our efforts against aristocracy than Monarchy. And we are therefore the better satisfied that this plain and direct avowal of their inseparability has been made ; as, had it not been so clearly demonstrated in the work before us, it certainly would have been our endeavor to do so.

Now we contend that a Canadian order of nobility is as impracticable as it is undesirable. A Canadian aristocracy is impracticable for want of the necessary *materials*. An aristocracy must have something besides the mere title to separate them from the mass of the people. Either it must be distinguished by birth, wealth, or education, or it will simply render itself contemptible, by assuming a superiority which it does not possess, and a position to which it is not entitled. Now, where in Canada shall we find this separate class, so distinguished—the materials out of which our future order of nobility is to be formed ? The fact is, such a class does not exist. True, we could possibly import our nobles with our monarchs, and establish our aristocracy with the scions of the English nobility. But few Canadians, we think, would be willing to place power in the hands of a class ignorant of the country and its requirements, and most likely having interests and opinions at variance with our own. It would be a palpable admission of our incapacity for self-government, and an acknowledgment that our affairs and interests were better understood by strangers from abroad than by ourselves. And we may conceive the estimate which the “imported” aristocracy would form of the Canadian character, and the opinion which they would hold of us in consequence.

Again—how is a hereditary aristocracy to be maintained in that position which they must necessarily assume—to use the words of the author—“to be independent in its fortunes both of the crown and of the people” ? Further on, we are told that “It (an aristocracy) needs no feudal privileges to make it useful for the end for which it is founded.” In what manner, then, is it to be supported ? Wealth, we all know, is proverbially insecure and uncertain in Canada—always changing hands, and

shifting from one to another. The millionaire of yesterday is perhaps worth little or nothing to-day. If we are to have an Order of nobility here, with sufficient wealth to render them independent of king and people, it is plain we must introduce primogeniture as a means of "keeping up the families" of the aristocrats, spite of Mr. McGee's declaration to the contrary, that no "feudal privileges" were needed for them. An aristocracy without "feudal privileges" would be an anomaly in any case.

But even if, by any means, it were found to be possible to maintain an aristocracy, would it be *desirable*? Would it be well to place power in the hands of a class, who, dazzled by their sudden elevation, would be disposed to regard with contempt those beneath them in the social scale. Already we have too much of the aristocratic feeling. Already there are those amongst us who affect to despise the farmer and the mechanic, —the "bone and sinew" of our country; and it should be our aim to repress rather than encourage this feeling, which the establishment of an aristocracy would assuredly tend to strengthen and develop.

The subject of immigration is one which has justly attracted a considerable degree of attention on the part of our Legislators. Every means has been tried to increase the flow of immigration from Europe to this country, and it would well become us to consider the effect our published opinions on the subject of government—as in some measure indicating our future system—might have on intending settlers in America. Now, one reason, perhaps the chief, why the United States are at present so generally preferred to Canada, is on account of their political institutions. Ours are generally, we allow, misrepresented and not understood; but still, if even the *name* of monarchy deters the European emigrant from seeking our shores, we may judge how its actual existence, together with a hereditary aristocracy, would operate. You may deem them unreasonable and prejudiced, but the fact of their predilections and prejudices remains; and it is doubtful if all our natural advantages will compensate, in the eyes of many, for the absence of Republican institutions, or off-set the presence of the aristocratic Monarchy.

"Ranks of nobility, to command respect, must be made honorable by the lives of their possessors."

But suppose they are *not* "made honorable by the lives of possessors," and consequently do *not* "command respect;" would it not be infinitely better to be entirely without social distinction than to see them turned into objects of ridicule, by the possible evil conduct of their possessors? And after all, it seems it is not the mere privileges and titles that "command respect," but the honorable lives of those who enjoy them. May we not, therefore, conclude that the same honor would be paid to the honorable lives without the titles?

A little further on we read, "It is, and always will be true,

"In every soil,

That those who think must govern those who toil."

Now, this is our idea exactly. We quite agree that those who think should be rulers. But is it regarded as an impossibility that those who toil should also think? Let the toilers be made thinkers, and self-government will be the result.

Of a piece with the last quoted paragraph, is an expression which occurs more than once, characterizing those who, if the new order of things were established, would be the "lower orders," as an "ignorant mob." Why ignorant, in a land of free schools and cheap literature? Why mob, in a land of law and order?

Again, we read—"Though in a Republic, men may prattle about their equality, yet even there, inequality reigns everywhere; inequality of wealth, inequality of social position, inequality of influence, inequality of office and power, to say nothing of that inequality which God stamps upon men; making one strong and another weak, one brave and another timid, one prompt and another vacillating—in every way unequal. In a Monarchy, this inequality is recognised. In a Republic it is disowned and disguised."

How recognised? By the creation of different ranks and grades of sociality, we shall be told. We deny it entirely. Now, even admitting that, in the formation of an order of nobility, those best entitled to the position were advanced to bear its dignities, still it must be remembered that this contemplated aristocracy is hereditary, and in the course of a few

years the occupants of high positions and of noble names may be in every way unfitted to succeed their predecessors. There are wealthy and aristocratic criminals and idiots, and poor and low born men of genius and virtue ; and what could be more ridiculous than to bestow class privileges on the former, because of the achievement of some remote ancestor ? No, no ! remove all distinction and restrictive barriers, and bestow on all the same advantages, regardless of race, creed, color or condition. Give all, as far as practicable, a fair start in the race of life, and each will find his place as naturally as water sinks or rises to its own level. Not that we believe the Jeffersonian doctrine, that "all men are born free and equal." By no means. We doubt very much whether any sane man ever really believed in the *actual, positive equality* of all men. When we see no two men formed with precisely similar powers or intellects, we do not see how there can be any such thing as absolute equality. "Inequality everywhere," as we have a short time since quoted.

The reason why, "in a Republic, this inequality is disowned and disguised," is the utter impossibility of establishing any rule or test to guide us in giving each man his due share of weight in the government. Of course it would be a very admirable plan if we could assign to every one exactly his proper place, taking into account not merely his wealth, but in addition, his physical and moral qualities, education, &c. But the difficulty would be in perfectly estimating these. How much "education," for instance, would be considered equal to \$1,000 ? What amount of courage and integrity would counterbalance a knowledge of the Latin language ? Should a descent from the ancient kings of Ireland, combined with practical experience in the dry goods business, entitle the "holder" to a vote ? These questions might be multiplied indefinitely, and he who discovers the correct method of solving them will rank among the great benefactors of his race. Until such time, however, as this discovery shall be made, the true plan seems to be, to let each individual, unimpeded by artificial distinctions, stand or fall on his own merits.

"Hereditary distinctions," says our author, "are forbidden in Democratic countries only, because, while all desire them, few can obtain them ; and it is for this reason, and this alone,

that the bulk of the people, moved by the most contemptible of all the passions, deny to others those outward signs of superiority they clearly covet, but are incapable of winning for themselves." Might not the charge of selfishness be, with equal justice and propriety, brought against those in favor of aristocracy, who so coolly assume their superiority, and consequent future elevation into the ranks of the proposed Peerage? The remark that "few would object to an aristocracy, if they only had the most meagre expectation of attaining its honors," i. e., whether they thought the system beneficial or otherwise, shows plainly the low estimate the writer has formed of public virtue. And is it, we ask, an aristocracy composed of such materials—of men who can be bought over with a title, to maintain systems of which they do not approve—of men who prefer private advancement to the public welfare—that we are to look for our national elevation? We are insensibly reminded of an article in the "Editor's Creed" of Hosea Biglow:—

"I do believe 'tis wise and good
To send out forrin missions,
That is, on sartain understood
An' orthodox conditions.
I mean nine thousand doll's per ann.,
Nine thousand more for out-fit;
AN' ME TO RECOMMEND A MAN
THE PLACE WOULD JEST ABOUT FIT."

We shouldn't wonder if Mr. McGee could "recommend a man" with a head just about *narrow enough* to fit a Ducal Coronet.

Now, we do most heartily agree with the positions laid down by the author, in the first part of the article under consideration. To give his own words:—

"To be a Canadian, a Nova Scotian, a New Brunswicker, a Prince Edward Islander confers no distinction, and gives no title to respect, because, for want of a distinct nationality, the people of these Provinces hold no recognised position in the world—they are only Colonists."

Again: "Canada—British America—cannot be content to be ever an out-lying dependency, either of England or the States. They must, or their people are not ruled, aspire to the rank and dignity of a free people, the independence of a nation." "As separate States, they would be too weak to maintain their

independence. They must, therefore, unite among themselves."

These sentiments we endorse—these principles commend themselves to us, and therefore the only point at issue between the writer of this article and ourselves, is the form of government under which the Independent Union of these Provinces is to exist. But we shall endeavor to show, by analogy, that the aristocratic or Conservative party is not the party of Union—that their principles, as a party, tend to political disintegration and division.

It must, doubtless, have been observed by many, that the political affairs of this country, (we allude more particularly to the situation of parties,) bear a striking resemblance to those of the United States. We shall, as clearly as possible, define the nature and extent of this resemblance.

In the first place, each country is divided into two principal sections, of different manners, habits and opinions, cherishing diverse institutions, and having conflicting interests. It is almost unnecessary to add, that in the one case we refer to North and South, and in the other to Upper and Lower Canada.

Next, we would observe, that in each instance, the smaller and less influential and wealthy community has, through political trickery, held the balance of power; and, in fact, by the assistance of a minority of the other section, ruled the whole country. Each has its "peculiar institution" to maintain—its particular relic of feudalism to preserve from the inroads of civilization. Each, under pretence of protecting its "laws and institutions," has bullied and tyrannized where it had the power. Need we add, that the Canadian counterpart of Southern slavery, considered in its *political* rather than in its *domestic* relations, may be found in the present iniquitous system of representation, and the corruption which has so long enriched the *habitans* of the Lower Province and their Upper Canadian tools at the expense of the Western Province.

But the parallel does not end here. In Upper Canada, as in the Northern States, a vile and venal party have sold themselves for office, and received their share of the spoils, as the price of those whose rights they were bound to protect. The South, deprived of the aid of the Northern Democrats, would

have been reduced to political insignificance. The Lower Canadians, without the votes of members from the Upper Province, would not have been able to force Separate Schools upon the unwilling people.

Again, both in the States and Provinces, a small but united Reform party—coming forward as the opponents of tyranny and corruption, and the friends of liberty and good government—have rapidly multiplied in number, and increased in influence, in the United States. Alarmed at this increase, and at the spread of their principles, the South withdrew from the Union, and inaugurated the present conflict.

Here the parallel terminates. God grant it may never go further. But it is possible, unless we take warning in time—that the Canadian, in studying the present war, may be *studying the future destiny of his own country!*

Now, if there ever can be any inferences drawn from the history of the past—if we are to place any confidence in the analogical deductions—in such event, what would be the position of the aristocratic, Conservative, nay, rather *Retrogressionist* party? Will they not either be ranged in open hostility to the flag they have sworn to defend, or yield it at most a timid and hesitating support? In a word, their position in a war between the sections would be that of the Secession and Copperhead Democracy in the States.

The aristocratic party, then, are not the party of national unity; and in forming the union of the British American Provinces, their policy should not guide us, nor ought their ideas to form the national sentiment, and shape our course. The framers of the new national constitution should be men of liberal, enlarged and progressive views, uninfluenced by the prejudices which are so apparent in the writings and speeches of the constitutional monarchists. We would briefly notice here, as one manifestation of this spirit, the extreme hatred of everything American, which appears in the articles before us. In speaking of the annexation policy of the United States, the Monroe doctrine, and the probable attempts to prevent union between the Provinces, they forget that the Democratic party, which has always been so strenuously opposed to British power on this continent—the believers in the Monroe and Manifest Destiny

doctrines—are now no longer in power ; and that the policy of the present government has been to maintain friendly relations with England, and that in doing so they have incurred the opprobrium of their opponents, who, in particular, blame them for the surrender of Mason and Slidell. Either the “British” Constitutional party are not so confident as they would lead us to believe, in the failure of Republicanism in the States, or they have forgotten a peculiarly “British” maxim, viz:—Never to triumph over a fallen foe.

The opponents of the introduction of the aristocratic element into our form of government, are, as we have seen, charged with motives of envy towards those who would be the recipients of the distinctions conferred by such a system. The writer mentions “the eagerness with which titles of nobility are sought after in *Democratic France*,” in support of this charge. How can a country be called “Democratic” where titles of honor exist, and which is under the rule of an Emperor ?

All through these articles we find the idea of “law,” “order,” and “authority,” continually brought forward as the great necessity of the country. Now, we think Canada will compare favorably with any country, in this respect. Notwithstanding all our leanings to Democracy, of late, it does not appear that insubordination and lawlessness have increased in a corresponding ratio. And even in the much-abused Northern States, if we except the low foreign-born population of the cities, and the comparatively new and unorganized Western settlements, we think the same remark will substantially hold good. Unfortunately, there are people who think the chief end of our existence is to be governed. They remind us of the New York fireman who opposed the introduction of a new machine, on the ground that if it was so perfect as it was represented, there would be no more fires. “And if there ain’t no fires, what ’ud be the good of livin’, say ?” To judge from appearances, did the time by any possibility arrive, when men attained to such perfection, as to be able absolutely to live without any government, the loss of their adored idol, “a British Constitutional Monarchy,” would be looked upon by them as a terrible calamity, and they would exclaim, with the fireman, “What’s the use of living any longer.”

The failure of the ancient Republics, is often brought forward as an argument against Democracy. Greece and Rome have perished, it is true, but have not the ancient Monarchies shared their fate? Egypt, Assyria, Persia, and many others, leaving little beside their names. And it is observable, that, of all the ancient nations, the two that have left their impress most perceptibly on modern civilization, and have moulded and formed the literature and language of modern peoples, are these two Republics. And if we take into account national position, power and stability, we shall find the Grecian and Roman Republics far in advance of contemporary kingdoms and empires.

France also, among modern countries, is often instanced as a warning example of the tendency of Republican institutions to end in a worse Despotism than that which they have succeeded. "Equality in France," says the writer whom we have followed, "has strangled Freedom." When, we would enquire, did France possess any freedom? Certainly not under the rule of the Bourbon dynasty. If ever, it must have been during the earlier part of the short-lived, because premature, Republic. But the example of France is not one which should influence us against Democracy. Throwing off the kingly authority, the French people cast aside all restraint, and plunged into the wildest excess, even renouncing their religion, and all they had hitherto held sacred. What could be expected from a government founded under such circumstances, but that ruin and disorganization which so quickly followed. But our government will not be the result of a sudden spasmodic effort, to be followed by a reaction almost as vigorous and unlooked-for, but will be simply the development and consummation of principles and elements already incorporated with our present order of things. We shall need no Revolution, no violent convulsion, disarranging our whole social and political structure, and arousing discordant elements. Merely the carrying out of principles already laid down—the extension of rights already admitted—the following out of a line of policy already entered upon, and the arrangement of a few matters of detail in relation to the working of its machinery, and the British American Republic is a fixed fact! And the sooner we recognise it as such, the better. The aristocratic party, at any rate know this perfectly:

well ; and they are accordingly trying to produce a re-action of feeling, and to inaugurate a retrograde movement, instead of the healthy and natural progress we have so long enjoyed. *They* talk of Revolution, indeed ! It is *they* who are the Revolutionists. Greater, infinitely greater, would be the Revolution we should experience by the establishment of a government to suit the aristocratic party, than by the introduction of the Republican system, which would be but the development and completion of our partially formed and as yet imperfect system, and into which we should glide so naturally and easily as barely to perceive the transition ; while the founding of an aristocratic form of Government would give a sudden check to our progressive tendencies, and the shock would be such as to create a commotion through the length and breadth of the land.

We cannot but regard vote by ballot, an elective judiciary, and other features of Republicanism as developed in the United States, justly objectionable as they may be considered, rather as incidental to, than inseparable from the system ; and being mere matters of detail, which can be sustained or abolished at the pleasure of the people, they should not be taken into consideration in discussing the *principles*. More especially as, perhaps, the most obnoxious of these—the election of judges—does not prevail universally even in the States.

The union of the Provinces must be real and actual instead of nominal. The present war in the States should warn us against a mere Federation, with its conflicting jurisdictions and doubtful prerogatives, and the debateable ground between Federal and State authorities which necessarily result from its adoption. A firm and compact union, recognizing no boundary lines between the Provinces ; having the population as its basis for Parliamentary representation, and one set of legislative enactments for the whole country, is the only union possible for us. Any other must fail from its inherent weakness and want of internal cohesion. Such a union will end at once, for ever, the vexed questions which perplex Canadians under the present union. The admission of the maritime Provinces into the union, and the principle of Representation by Population, will give such a preponderance to the British element in the Parliament of the new nation, as completely to crush out and over-

whelm the French sentiment and influence. And here let us state our convictions, that the French Canadian "laws, language and institutions" are *doomed* in any event. The Frenchman must at length succumb to the Anglo-Saxon. They must no longer be permitted to clog the wheels of our progress, and to hinder the working out of our glorious destiny. Politicians may talk as loudly as they please about respecting the "laws, language and institutions" of the Lower Canadians, in the event of our obtaining Representation by Population; but once having got the power, it needs little knowledge of history and human nature to teach us that we would proscribe their language, repeal their laws, and modify their institutions. The question is just this: Shall one-fourth part of the people of British North America, of *foreign* descent, speaking a *foreign* language, having laws and institutions of the sixteenth rather than the nineteenth century, be suffered to bar the progress and prevent the advancement to national greatness of the British portion of the community—or, in case they see fit to separate from them, to block their pathway to the ocean, and interpose a barrier to their free communication, in a *British* colony, won by *Britons* at the mouth of the cannon and point of the bayonet? Justice to ourselves and our posterity demands, that we shall transmit to them unimpaired the whole territory now comprised in British North America. Lower Canada cannot be permitted to withdraw from the Union; neither remaining in it, must she have an undue share of weight in its councils. She will, by degrees—slowly perhaps, at first—become Anglicized. Her wealth and prosperity will be increased, her resources developed, and her people educated. Fifty years hence, the French language will be as much out of place in our Parliament as the Erse or Gaelic in that of Great Britain.

We shall be told by those claiming to be *par excellence* the *British* party, that this would be a gross injustice, and an outrage upon the rights of the Lower Canadians; but we would enquire which is the greater injustice, that three-quarters of a million of people should prevent the remaining two and a half millions, or thereabouts, from forming a homogeneous, compact and substantial Union, or that they should be required for the furtherance of so desirable an end, to give up their peculiar laws.

and customs, and the privilege of using their language on public and legal occasions, on receiving, in return, all the benefits resulting from becoming a part of a powerful and independent nation? Besides, the *British Constitutionalists* entirely ignore the existence of the *British Lower Canadians*. It is, indeed, according to their ideas, an intolerable injustice to force our institutions upon the French Canadians; but they are disposed to view quite complacently the French Canadians imposing *their* institutions upon the British residents in the Lower Province.

We do not intend to enter further into the minutiae of the system we advocate, and to specify the various details incidental to its development. This is beyond our province, and the limits of the present undertaking, as it has been our intention to confine ourselves, in the main, to the discussion of the *principle*, and its adaptability to our country.

There are those, and perhaps they form the majority of the inhabitants of British America, who, while they ridicule the schemes put forth for a Monarchy, are not as yet prepared to embrace Republicanism. They will admit that Canada cannot always continue a dependency of England, and yet they do not seem to realize that if we are to exist as an independent nation we must make a choice between the two forms of government.

After all, the great argument against the formation of a British American aristocratic Monarchy seems to be, that it is contrary to the progressive spirit of our people, and the age in which we live. This is the nineteenth century—the age of progress. The world moves. Oft-repeated and well-worn phrases, these, it is true, but people seem, at times, to forget them. The measures that might have been looked on as suitable, and in accordance with public sentiment, one hundred, fifty or even twenty years ago, may well be regarded now as obsolete and impracticable, when we think of the vast moral and physical changes—the mighty developments of crude and imperfect elements: the rapid transformations and advancements which have taken place during a comparatively short period. In the physical world, this advancement is palpable, tangible, perceptible. The shriek of the locomotive, and the ringing blows of the woodman's axe, speak in language all can understand. No one of common observation doubts our material

progress—the increase of our resources, population and power. But it is more difficult to trace the march of intellect than to follow the surging tide of population in its onward career. Because we are unable to trace great moral ideas and principles in their course, to define their limits and mark their progress with precision, shall we, on that account, doubt or ignore their existence? Or may we not rather conclude them to have an equal range, and equally wide-spread diffusion and rapid progress with the more evident and material sources of our prosperity?

“The heir of all the ages in the foremost files of time.”

Canada “takes no step backwards.” “It still moves,” was the muttered exclamation of the Italian philosopher, after having abjured the cry of the motion of the earth. And though we may deny, and shut our eyes to the truth as presented to us, it will not, on that account, cease to be the truth. Long has it been the boast and pride of England that “No slave can breathe the British air.” And may it not be said, with equal truth, that the free air of America is fatal to aristocracy? You may introduce its form and titles—you may have the outward semblance of the system—but it will be wanting in vitality—it will possess no energy or inherent force. If it flourish, it will be as a poor sickly exotic, kept alive by unnatural and spasmodic efforts, and unable to maintain a healthy, vigorous existence, Aristocracy cannot long survive transplantation to American soil.

Now, the inevitable tendency of our progress is towards Democratic Republicanism—some would say Americanism, falling into the common error of confounding Republicanism with Annexation. Shall we, alarmed by the bug-bear of Annexation, endeavor to retard this inevitable progress, and fall back on the feudalism which the European nations are attempting to throw off? Ought we not rather, ascertaining the true nature of this progressive tendency, to hasten it on as far as in us lies, to its consummation in what appears to be the system most in harmony with our national character, most conducive to the attainment of that high national position we desire, and most in accordance with the spirit of the age, and the aspirations of a people esteeming themselves capable of self-government—a United British American Independent Republic?

nd power.
et than to
eer. Be-
principles
r progress
more their
o have an
rapid pro-
our pros-

ves," was
after hav-
nd though
nted to us,
ong has it
an breathe
truth, that
may intro-
semblance
ill possess
as a poor
ic efforts,
e, Aristo-
n soil.

s towards
ericanism,
blicanism
ar of An-
s, and fall
e attempt-
the true
far as in
e system
conducive
esire, and
spirations
rnment—

